

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CHERUNDA FOX,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 03-74755

YUKINS, et al.,

Honorable Patrick J. Duggan

Defendants.

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

At a session of said Court, held in the U.S.
District Courthouse, Eastern District
of Michigan, on March 8, 2007.

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE PATRICK J. DUGGAN
U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

On December 2, 2003, Plaintiff Cherunda Fox filed a *pro se* prisoner civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Defendants Yukins, Singhal, Atkinson, Powell, Bavineni, Jackson, Babue, and Seaton, who are all employees at the Scott Correctional Facility. Sometime in 2004, Defendant Powell died, therefore he was no longer a party to the action. In an Opinion and Order dated March 30, 2005, this Court dismissed Defendants Yukins, Atkinson, Bavineni, and Jackson. In an Opinion and Order dated June 7, 2005, this Court dismissed the remaining Defendants, Defendants Singhal, Babue, and Seaton. On June 7, 2005, this Court entered a Judgment dismissing Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice as to all Defendants. Subsequently, on March 9, 2006, this

Court entered an Order denying Plaintiff's post-judgment motion for injunctive relief for lack of jurisdiction. Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's post-judgment Motion for Injunctive Relief Amended, filed on January 30, 2007.

In her Motion for Injunctive Relief Amended, Plaintiff contends:

Once again, the doctor's and their professional associations have killed another family member due to the filing of this action in the federal court by me. This is in violation of my civil rights enacted in 1866, that allows me to sue, make contracts, etc. the same as a white man in America.

Plaintiff asks the Court "to enjoin the defendant doctors from using their professional associations to kill my relatives due to the filing of this lawsuit."

Plaintiff cites no authority for her post-judgment motion. The Court does not believe that Plaintiff's motion was brought pursuant to Rule 60(a) or (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because Plaintiff's motion does not ask the Court to alter or amend the judgment.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED, that Plaintiff's Motion for Injunctive Relief Amended is **DENIED**.

s/PATRICK J. DUGGAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies to:
Cherunda Fox
20517 Harper Woods, MI 48225

Julia R. Bell, A.A.G.
Felipe H. Hall, A.A.G.
Kimberly A. Koester, Esq.